

The Editor BMJ
BMA House, Tavistock Square
London WC1H 9JR
editor@bmj.com
T + 44 (0)20 7387 4499
F + 44 (0)20 7383 6418

BMA MEMBERS' INQUIRIES
membership@bma.org.uk
020 7383 6599

BMJ CAREERS ADVERTISING
sales@bmjcareers.com
020 7383 6531

DISPLAY ADVERTISING
sales@bmj.com
020 7383 6350

REPRINTS
reprints@bmj.com
020 8346 1339

SUBSCRIPTIONS
subscriptions@bmj.com
020 7383 6270

For "Who is Who" at the *BMJ*
see bmj.com/contacts

For advice to contributors see
bmj.com/advice

To submit an article go to
submit.bmj.com



The *BMJ* is published by BMJ Publishing Group Ltd, a wholly owned subsidiary of the British Medical Association.

The BMA grants editorial freedom to the Editor of the *BMJ*. The views expressed in the journal are those of the authors and may not necessarily comply with BMA policy.

The *BMJ* follows guidelines on editorial independence produced by the World Association of Medical Editors (www.wame.org/wamestmt.htm#independence) and the code on good publication practice produced by the Committee on Publication Ethics (www.publicationethics.org.uk/cope1999/gpp/gpp.html#gpp).



©BMJ Publishing Group Ltd 2004.

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any other means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission, in writing, of the BMJ

US second class postage paid at Rahway, NJ. Postmaster: send address changes to BMJ, c/o Mercury Airfreight International Ltd Inc, 365 Blair Road, Avenel, NJ 07001, USA. \$544. Weekly

Printed by Wyndeham Heron and Co

This week in the BMJ

Steroids do not prevent long term nerve damage in leprosy



JIM HOLMES/PAFOS

Giving prednisolone to patients with leprosy does not prevent long term nerve damage. Smith and colleagues (p 1459) randomised 635 people with newly diagnosed multibacillary leprosy from Bangladesh and Nepal to prophylaxis with low dose prednisolone (20 mg/day for three months) or placebo, in addition to standard multidrug treatment. They found that prednisolone can prevent reaction and impairment of nerve function at four months, but only in people without pre-existing nerve damage, and the effect was not sustained at one year. Routine use of prophylactic steroids in all patients with multibacillary leprosy is not justified, say Lockwood and Kumar (p 1447) in an accompanying editorial.

Pancreatitis is more common, but results are not improving

Pancreatitis has become more common in the past 35 years, but survival has not improved since the 1970s. Goldacre and Roberts (p 1466) found that admissions for acute pancreatitis in southern England increased between 1963 and 1998, from 4.9 to 9.8 per 100 000 people, particularly among the

younger age groups. Mortality was 14.2% in 1963-74, 7.6% in 1975-86, and 6.7% in 1987-98. Death rates in the first month after an attack are about 30 times higher than death rates in the general population.

Cancer trials satisfy the uncertainty principle



ALEX PHANIEFEX

Enrolling patients into trials is ethical when there is uncertainty about which treatment is more appropriate for them—the "uncertainty principle." Reviewing 93 cancer trials and 103 randomisations from the United States, Joffe and colleagues (p 1463) found that, on average, the experimental treatment resulted in slightly better disease control than standard treatment did. The heterogeneity of results and the small average effect indicate that on average these trials followed the uncertainty principle.

Lung cancer patients feel stigmatised



PAUL BROWN/SPR

Educational interventions help people quit smoking, but they often portray a dreadful death, which may exacerbate fear and anxiety, and they increase the stigma

experienced by patients with lung cancer. Chapple and colleagues (p 1470) found that patients felt particularly stigmatised because the disease is strongly associated with smoking. Many felt unjustly blamed for their illness, and those who resisted victim blaming emphasised the culpability of tobacco companies. Stigmatisation can deter patients from seeking support and can have negative financial consequences for patients.

Nursing home effect may explain high mortality



JOHN GILES/PA

Looking after patients who live in nursing homes, and who are more likely to die than patients in the community, may explain excessively high mortality in general practice. Mohammed and colleagues (p 1474) analysed the case mix and results of two general practitioners flagged up by the Shipman inquiry as having higher mortality than expected, and they found that the GPs were looking after a high proportion of patients living in nursing homes, which explained their results. GPs with high mortality merit a proper investigation for credible causes, say the authors.

Clinical databases are common, but need improving

Multicentre clinical databases exist in all areas of health care, but they are unevenly distributed and of differing quality. Reviewing 105 databases across the

United Kingdom, Black and colleagues (p 1478) found that cancer and surgery were better covered than other specialties, and databases varied greatly in size, scope, geographical areas covered, and quality. Audit and research potential is not fully used, say the authors; considerable scope for improvements exists, which could be facilitated by a national support unit.

Treat minor burns effectively

Most minor burns can be safely managed in primary

care. In the third article of our ABC of burns (p 1487), Hudspeth and Rayatt give some important tips on how to treat patients with minor burns. The first aid given can influence the final cosmetic outcome: stopping the burning process, prompt cooling with tepid tap water, covering the burn (cling film is ideal), and keeping the patient warm is paramount. Burns should be kept clean, but routine use of antibiotics should be discouraged, say the authors. If the burns have not healed within two weeks, refer the patients to a burn surgeon.

POEM*

Progesterone IUD is effective for menorrhagia

Question Which is preferred in the treatment of menorrhagia: hysterectomy or the levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system?

Synopsis Menorrhagia is a significant worldwide health problem and is the major presenting symptom for women who undergo hysterectomy. The levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system (LNG-IUS) is an intrauterine system that slowly releases a steady amount of levonorgestrel. It is currently being used in Finland for treatment of menorrhagia, but is approved in the United States only as a contraceptive device. A total of 236 Finnish women (mean age 43 years) with menorrhagia were randomly assigned (concealed allocation assignment) to treatment with this system or hysterectomy. Follow up was monitored for 96% of the patients for five years. Outcomes were self assessed by patients not blinded to treatment assignment using prevalidated health questionnaires and surveys. With intention to treat analysis, after five years no significant differences in health outcomes or overall satisfaction with care were reported by the two groups. Although 42% of women initially assigned to the LNG-IUS group eventually underwent hysterectomy, both the direct and indirect costs were lower for patients assigned to the LNG-IUS group than for those in the assigned hysterectomy group (\$2817 v \$4660 per participant). Since the introduction of LNG-IUS in Finland in 1998, hysterectomy rates have fallen by 13%.

Bottom line Women with menorrhagia often require hysterectomy for symptom relief and health satisfaction. The levonorgestrel releasing intrauterine system resulted in similar outcomes for many women and is more cost effective as initial treatment.

Level of evidence 1b (see www.infoPOEMs.com/levels.html). Individual randomised controlled trials (with a wide confidence interval).

Hurskainen R, Teperi J, Rissanen P, et al. Clinical outcomes and costs with the levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system or hysterectomy for treatment of menorrhagia. Randomized trial 5-year follow-up. *JAMA* 2004;291:1456-63.

©infoPOEMs 1992-2003 www.infoPOEMs.com/informationmastery.cfm

* Patient-Oriented Evidence that Matters. See editorial (*BMJ* 2002;325:983)

Editor's choice

Doctors are not scientists

Some doctors are scientists—just as some politicians are scientists—but most are not. As medical students they were filled full with information on biochemistry, anatomy, physiology, and other sciences, but information does not a scientist make—otherwise, you could become a scientist by watching the Discovery channel. A scientist is somebody who constantly questions, generates falsifiable hypotheses, and collects data from well designed experiments—the kind of people who brush their teeth on only one side of their mouth to see whether brushing your teeth has any benefit. Most doctors follow familiar patterns and rules, often improvising around those rules. In their methods of working they are more like jazz musicians than scientists.

Questioning whether doctors are scientists may seem outrageous, but most doctors know that they are not scientists. I once asked a room of perhaps 150 medically trained educators which of them thought of themselves as scientists. About five put up their hands.

If doctors are not scientists then it seems odd to supply them, as medical journals do, with a steady stream of original scientific studies. Teachers and social workers are not sent original research. Nurses are sent some, but are they simply aping the illogical ways of doctors?

The inevitable consequence is that most readers of medical journals don't read the original articles. They may scan the abstract, but it's the rarest of beasts who reads an article from beginning to end, critically appraising it as he or she goes. Indeed, most doctors are incapable of critically appraising an article. They have never been trained to do so. Instead, they must accept the judgment of the editorial team and its peer reviewers—until one of the rare beasts writes in and points out that a study is scientifically nonsensical.

Sometimes readers will alight on an article as a bee alights on a flower to suck a little honey. They will alight, I suspect, for reasons that are more personal than scientific. I am interested in the study showing a steady rise in hospital admissions for acute pancreatitis from 1963 to 1998 (p 1466) because my brother had pancreatitis—maybe, indeed, that link had something to do with the study making it into the journal just as it's been suggested that the *BMJ* publishes on toenail fungus because so many of the editorial team suffer from it. The authors note that the prognosis of acute pancreatitis is poor and that mortality after admission has not fallen since the 1970s—reflecting the absence of innovations in treatment.

I am attracted as well to the study on whether the uncertainty principle is violated in clinical trials (p 1463). The principle says that you shouldn't conduct a trial if you think that one treatment is likely to be better than another. The study looked to see if trials more often favoured the experimental treatment. I guessed they would—and, indeed, they did. The authors, however, judge that the trials do satisfy the uncertainty principle. I'm unconvinced.

Richard Smith *editor* rsmith@bmj.com

To receive Editor's choice by email each week subscribe via our website: bmj.com/cgi/customalert